

1 PAUL B. BEACH, State Bar No. 166265  
pbeach@lbaclaw.com  
2 SCOTT CARON, State Bar No. 227871  
scaron@lbaclaw.com  
3 LAWRENCE BEACH ALLEN & CHOI, PC  
100 West Broadway, Suite 1200  
4 Glendale, California 91210-1219  
Telephone No. (818) 545-1925  
5 Facsimile No. (818) 545-1937

6 Attorneys for Defendants  
County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department,  
7 Sheriff Lee Baca, Assistant Sheriff William Stonich, Larry W. Waldie,  
Assistant Sheriff Doyle R. Campbell, Assistant Paul K. Tanaka and  
8 Division Chief Marc L. Klugman

9  
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
11 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 JULIO ALVARADO,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 WILLIAM BRATTON, et al..

16 Defendants.  
17  
18  
19

) Case No. CV 06-7812 PA (RCx)

) Honorable Percy Anderson

) **STIPULATION TO**  
) **CONTINUE HEARING ON**  
) **DEFENDANTS' MOTION**  
) **FOR RECONSIDERATION;**  
) **DECLARATION OF SCOTT**  
) **E. CARON**

20 TO THE CLERK OF COURT AND TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND  
21 THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1       The parties herein, by and through the undersigned counsel, hereby  
2 stipulate as follows:

3       1.     On June 18, 2009, Defendants County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles  
4 County Sheriff's Department, Sheriff Lee Baca, Assistant Sheriff William  
5 Stonich, Larry W. Waldie, Assistant Sheriff Doyle R. Campbell, Assistant Sheriff  
6 Paul K. Tanaka and Division Chief Marc L. Klugman (hereinafter, "County  
7 Defendants") filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's June 1, 2009 order  
8 denying Defendants' motion for summary judgment. The motion is currently set  
9 for hearing on July 27, 2009. The primary issue presented in the motion is the  
10 appropriate legal standard for addressing claims of quasi-judicial immunity.

11       2.     The County Defendants have since met and conferred with Plaintiff on  
12 another motion for summary judgment to address the remaining issues of qualified  
13 immunity, *Monell* liability, the alleged violation of Plaintiff's constitutional rights,  
14 and immunity on Plaintiff's state law claims. The County Defendants originally  
15 intended to file the motion in late June, and to set it for hearing on July 27 so that  
16 the hearing would coincide with the motion for reconsideration. The County  
17 Defendants believe that a joint hearing date will be to the benefit of the parties and  
18 the Court and in the interest of judicial economy, as it will permit the Court to  
19 address all issues at once and will assure that, in the event the motions are denied,  
20 there will be only one interlocutory appeal.

21       3.     The County Defendants have discovered that they will be unable to  
22 have the anticipated motion for summary judgment heard on July 27, as they  
23 require additional time to conduct investigation and to prepare the motion.  
24 Defendants reasonably believe they will be able to file the motion by the end of  
25 July, to be set for hearing in August.

26       4.     Accordingly, the parties have agreed to continue the hearing on  
27 Defendants' motion for reconsideration from July 27, 2009, to August 31, 2009.

28 //

1 Defendants intend to file their motion for summary judgment by the end of July,  
2 and will set it for hearing on the same date.

3  
4 Dated: July 8, 2009

LAWRENCE BEACH ALLEN & CHOI, PC

5  
6  
7 By 

Scott E. Caron

8 Attorneys for Defendants,  
9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES  
10 COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,  
11 SHERIFF LEE BACA, ASSISTANT SHERIFF  
12 WILLIAM STONICH, LARRY W. WALDIE,  
13 ASSISTANT SHERIFF DOYLE R.  
14 CAMPBELL; ASSISTANT PAUL K. TANAKA

15  
16  
17 Dated: July 8, 2009

ROBERT MANN & DONALD W. COOK

Attorneys at Law

18  
19 By 

Donald W. Cook

20 Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
21 JULIO ALVARADO

22  
23  
24 Dated: July \_\_\_, 2009

CARMEN TRUTANICH, City Attorney  
MICHAEL L. CLAESSENS, Senior Assistant  
City Attorney  
CORY M. BRENT, Assistant City Attorney

25  
26  
27 By \_\_\_\_\_

Surekha A. Pessis, Deputy City Attorney

28 Attorneys for Defendants,  
CITY OF LOS ANGELES, WILLIAM J.  
BRATTON, DAVID GRIMES, ERIK SCHICK,  
and MICHAEL LAMBARTH

1 Defendants intend to file their motion for summary judgment by the end of July,  
2 and will set it for hearing on the same date.

3  
4 Dated: July \_\_, 2009

LAWRENCE BEACH ALLEN & CHOI, PC

5  
6  
7 By \_\_\_\_\_

8 Scott E. Caron

9 Attorneys for Defendants,  
10 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES  
11 COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,  
12 SHERIFF LEE BACA, ASSISTANT SHERIFF  
WILLIAM STONICH, LARRY W. WALDIE,  
ASSISTANT SHERIFF DOYLE R.  
CAMPBELL; ASSISTANT PAUL K. TANAKA

13 Dated: July \_\_, 2009

ROBERT MANN & DONALD W. COOK

14 Attorneys at Law

15  
16 By \_\_\_\_\_

17 Donald W. Cook

18 Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
19 JULIO ALVARADO

20 Dated: July 8, 2009

CARMEN TRUTANICH, City Attorney  
MICHAEL L. CLAESSENS, Senior Assistant  
City Attorney  
CORY M. BRENT, Assistant City Attorney

21  
22  
23  
24 By  \_\_\_\_\_

25 Surekha A. Pessis, Deputy City Attorney

26 Attorneys for Defendants,  
27 CITY OF LOS ANGELES, WILLIAM J.  
BRATTON, DAVID GRIMES, ERIK SCHICK,  
28 and MICHAEL LAMBARTH

**DECLARATION OF SCOTT E. CARON**

I, Scott E. Caron, declare as follows:

1. The following is based upon my personal knowledge and if called upon as a witness, I could and would competently testify thereto. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice before this Court and all the courts of the State of California. I am an associate in the law firm of Lawrence Beach Allen & Choi, PC, attorneys for Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES COUNTY. SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, SHERIFF LEE BACA, ASSISTANT SHERIFF WILLIAM STONICH, LARRY W. WALDIE, ASSISTANT SHERIFF DOYLE R. CAMPBELL, ASSISTANT PAUL K. TANAKA, and DIVISION CHIEF MARC L. KLUGMAN (hereinafter, the "County Defendants").

2. On June 18, 2009, the County Defendants filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's June 1, 2009 order denying Defendants' motion for summary judgment. The motion is set for hearing on July 27, 2009. The primary issue presented in the motion is the appropriate legal standard for addressing claims of quasi-judicial immunity.

3. I have since met and conferred with Plaintiff's counsel on another motion for summary judgment to address the remaining issues of qualified immunity, *Monell* liability, the alleged violation of Plaintiff's constitutional rights, and immunity on Plaintiff's state law claims. I originally intended to file the motion in late June, and to set it for hearing on July 27 so that the hearing would coincide with the motion for reconsideration. I believe that a joint hearing date will be to the benefit of the parties and the Court and in the interest of judicial economy, as it will permit the Court to address all issues at once and will assure that, in the event the motions are denied, there will be only one interlocutory appeal.

//

4. I am primarily responsible for preparing the County Defendants' motion for summary judgment. Although I have attempted to complete the motion for summary judgment in time to have it heard on July 27, I require additional time to conduct investigation and complete the motion. I believe I will be able to file the motion before the end of the month, and will therefore be able to set it for hearing in August.

5. Plaintiff has noticed the depositions of the individual City of Los Angeles Defendants for July 22. The depositions will most likely need to be continued due to the unavailability of counsel for the City of Los Angeles. I expect that Plaintiff will want to take the depositions before his opposition to the motion for summary judgment is due. If the motion for summary judgment is set for hearing in August, Plaintiff should have sufficient time to complete the depositions.

6. A continuance of the hearing on Defendants' motion for reconsideration to August 31, 2009 will assure that it can be heard on the same date as the upcoming motion for summary judgment. That way, the parties can brief and the Court can decide all issues at the same time. To have both motions heard at the same time will also assure that there will be only one interlocutory appeal in the event the Court denies the motions.

7. Plaintiff has not yet filed his opposition to the motion for reconsideration. In addition, there has been no prior request for a continuance of the hearing on the motion for reconsideration.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July 8, 2009 at Glendale, California.

Scott E. Caron